

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
. 09/853,443	05/11/2001	Dale E. Gulick	2000.039600/TT3769	6306
23720	7590 12/08/2004		EXAMINER	
	S, MORGAN & AME	LANIER, BENJAMIN E		
10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100 HOUSTON, TX 77042			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2132	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

' .		7			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/853,443	GULICK ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Benjamin E Lanier	2132			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was reply to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-80 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-80</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 11 May 2001 is/are: a)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	` '			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
The path of declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	ACTION OF TORM PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents)-(d) or (f).			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior					
application from the International Bureau	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.			
Attachment(s)	∧ □	(DTO 440)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/3/2002.		atent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 5, 6, 13, 18, 19, 27, 33, 34, 37, 48, 49, 63, 64, 67, 74 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim 5 attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 4, from which claim 5 depends.

Claim 6, which depends from claim 5, further attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 4.

Claim 13 attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 12, from which claim 13 depends.

Claim 18 attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claims 17, from which claim 18 depends.

Claim 19, which depends from claim 18, further attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 17.

Claim 27 attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 26, from which claim 27 depends.

Claim 33 attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 32, from which claim 33 depends.

Claim 34, which depends from claim 33, further attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 32.

Claim 37 attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 36, from which claim 37 depends.

Claim 48 attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 47, from which claim 48 depends.

Claim 49, which depends from claim 48, further attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 47.

Claim 63 attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 62, from which claim 63 depends.

Claim 64, which depends from claim 63, further attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 62.

Claim 67 attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 66, from which claim 67 depends.

Claim 74 attempts to redefine how the biometric data is being encrypted when this has been previously defined in claim 73, from which claim 74 depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 3, 16, 31, 35, 46, 50, 61, 65, 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. Claims 3, 16, 31, 35, 46, 50, 61, 65, 68 recite the limitation "at least an indication", which renders the claims indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-12, 14-17, 20-24, 26, 28-32, 35, 36, 38-47, 50-62, 65, 66, 68-71, 73, 75-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gennaro, U.S. Patent No. 6,317,834. Referring to claims 1, 2, 4, 8-12, 14, 15, 21-24, 26, 28-32, 36, 39-45, 47, 51-60, 62, 66, 68-71, 73, 75-80, Gennaro discloses a biometric authentication system wherein biometric information in the form of fingerprints, voice pattern, retinal pattern, iris scans, and signatures (Col. 1, lines 35-39) is captured along with personal information unique to each individual (Col. 1, lines 62-67 & Col. 2, lines 32-34), which meets the limitation of receiving biometric data. The biometric data is then encrypted with random data (Col. 2, lines 1-5, 27-31), which meets the limitation of receiving a nonce, and encrypting the biometric data using the nonce and to transmit only encrypted biometric data and the nonce. The encrypted biometric information is then stored along with the random data in a biometric database (Col. 2, lines 45-57). The biometric information can also be encrypted using a key generated from password information (Col. 1, line 67 Col. 2, line 2), which meets the limitation of receiving a secret, and encrypting the biometric data

(Col. 3, lines 4-19), which meets the limitation of the master device decrypting the encrypted biometric data.

Referring to claims 7, 20, Gennaro discloses acquiring a personal identifier (Col. 2, line 9), which would meet the limitation of the secret comprising a GUID.

Referring to claims 16, 17, 35, 38, 46, 50, 61, 65, Gennaro discloses that in order to authenticate a biometric record the user provides the system with a personal identifier, which meets the limitation of a GUID or secret, and a biometric sample that corresponds to the biometric record that is being authenticated (Col. 4, lines 41-56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 9. Claims 25, 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gennaro, U.S. Patent No. 6,317,834, in view of Huang, U.S. Patent No. 5,856,789. Referring to claims 25, 72, Gennaro discloses a biometric authentication system wherein biometric information in the

u_{na} 🔩 🔻 🖜

form of fingerprints, voice pattern, retinal pattern, iris scans, and signatures (Col. 1, lines 35-39) is captured along with personal information unique to each individual (Col. 1, lines 62-67 & Col. 2, lines 32-34), which meets the limitation of receiving biometric data. The biometric data is then encrypted with random data (Col. 2, lines 1-5, 27-31), which meets the limitation of receiving a nonce, and encrypting the biometric data using the nonce and to transmit only encrypted biometric data and the nonce. The encrypted biometric information is then stored along with the random data in a biometric database (Col. 2, lines 45-57). The biometric information can also be encrypted using a key generated from password information (Col. 1, line 67 – Col. 2, line 2), which meets the limitation of receiving a secret, and encrypting the biometric data using only the secret. Gennaro does not disclose that the system utilizes a processor, north bridge, and south bridge. Huang discloses a computer system containing a processor, north bridge, and south bridge (Col. 2, lines 63-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a computer system configuration of Huang in the biometric authentication system of Gennaro because Huang discloses that disclosed computer system configuration is state of the art (Col. 2, line 63).

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin E Lanier whose telephone number is 703-305-7684. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th0 7:30am-5:00pm, F 7:30am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (703)305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/853,443

Art Unit: 2132

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin E. Lanier

THOMAS R. PEESO PRIMARY EXAMINER